

## REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated March 7, 2005. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Bilger et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,317,835 (Bilger). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bilger in view of Finley et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,442,448 ("Finley"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows.

Claim 1 specifies that the coordinate data from the touch screen is encrypted with a processor, then decrypted. Claim 1 further specifies that after decryption, sensitive coordinate data is separated from non-sensitive data with the non-sensitive data being used to in providing display information to a display. The decrypted sensitive data is then encrypted to maintain security thereof. Bilger does not teach, suggest or disclose the encryption-decryption-separation-encryption process specified in claim 1.

Rather, Bilger discloses a method in which a device, referred to as a T-PED functions, in different modes, as a convention touch screen device and as a PIN entry device (See, col. 4, lines 57-64). The T-PED communicates with the application program using a protocol having an "Input Mode Select" command that may be set to "select PIN mode" or "Select Clear Mode" (See, col. 5, lines 1-6). In the clear mode, the T-PED functions as a conventional touch screen device (See, col. 6, lines 7-34). In the PIN entry mode, the T-PED functions as a PIN entry device, displaying an industry standard PIN pad, encrypting user entries and forwarding the encrypted data to the application program (See, col. 6, lines 60-63). Accordingly, there is no reason for Bilger to encrypt data entered in the clear mode or to decrypt and separate data entered in the PIN entry mode

The difference between Bilger and the invention specified in claim 1 is that Bilger does not encrypt-decrypt and then separate sensitive information. Rather, the device disclosed in Bilger operates in two different modes: a clear mode for conventional touch screen operation and a second PIN entry mode for entering sensitive information. Consequently, there is no need for Bilger to utilize the encryption-decryption-separation-encryption process specified in claim 1.

Since Bilger does not disclose (1) decrypting data received in the PIN entry mode, (2) separating the decrypted data into sensitive and non-sensitive coordinate data, (3) using the non-sensitive data in providing information to a display, and (4) re-encrypting the sensitive data, Bilger cannot anticipate claim 1. Therefore Applicants submit that claim 1, along with dependent claims 2 and 4-10 are allowable over Bilger.

Finley, cited solely for teaching a terminal device that transmits encrypted sensitive information to a network, does cure the deficiencies of Bilger. Consequently, dependent claim 3 is believed to be allowable over the combination.

Applicants have amended paragraph [0001] of the specification in response to the comments in the Office Action. Paragraphs [0016], [0043] and [0058] have been amended to correct typographical errors.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of the pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/EFTD-25,791 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants

/Gregory M. Howison, Reg. # 30,646/  
Gregory M. Howison  
Registration No. 30,646

GMH/ljo

P.O. Box 741715  
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715  
Tel: 972-479-0462  
Fax: 972-479-0464  
December 11, 2006